

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 18-26 remain pending in the application.

In response to the Office Action's observations, four sheets of replacement drawings are included. Figure 6 has been designated by a legend as described.

The Specification was amended to remedy informalities noted.

In response to the claim objections, claims 18, 21, and 24 were amended. These amendments should overcome the objections for dependent claims 19-20, 22-23, and 25-26. These amendments were not made to address matters of patentability; rather they were made to facilitate prosecution of the case.

With regard to the §112 rejection of claims 12-26, Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant asserts that there is no indefiniteness. There is a "first signal" and other signals such as, for example, "an I transmit signal and a Q transmit signal," as outlined in the claimed features. To one skilled in the art, the claims, as presented, present the scope of the invention sought to be patented. See MPEP §2173.02. A fundamental principle contained in 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is that applicants are their own lexicographers. As noted by the Court in *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 160 USPQ 226 (ccPA197), a claim may not be rejected solely because of the type of language used to define the subject matter for which patent protection is sought.

Applicant requests the withdrawal of the §112 rejection.

With regard to double patenting rejection of claims 18-20, Applicant has enclosed a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate this rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant believes he has addressed the Examiner's concerns. A timely Notice of Allowance is earnestly requested.

Please charge any fees other than the issue fee and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account 50-4019.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 30, 2007

By: /Peter Zawilski/
Peter Zawilski, Reg. No. 43,305
(408) 474-9063

Correspondence Address:
Intellectual Property Department
NXP B.V.
1109 McKay Drive; MS41
San Jose, CA 95131 USA

Customer Number: 65913